

SPEAKER BARRETT: Three minutes.

SENATOR MOREHEAD: I guess that this is really one of the points that I make, too, you know. It is not that we wouldn't all take a look at this, including Senator Hall, but, to have this brought to us right now, I find a little stress with it. I know we've discussed it. I have no problem with it, but then I don't...you know, I'm not so adamant about this particular issue that I would urge you to vote one way or the other on it. Thank you.

SPEAKER BARRETT: Thank you. Senator Hannibal, followed by Senator Hartnett.

SENATOR HANNIBAL: Mr. Speaker and members, I also rise to support the Hall amendment to this amendment. It has been pointed out by Senator Landis, and I appreciate his concern that it came to us late. I appreciate Senator Hall pointing this issue out to me as I was outside the Chamber when it came and I do have some real concerns with it. I'm extremely pleased that Senator Miller did read the current statute. Current statute is very good policy when it starts talking about private enterprise doing their business as far as rents and such that we are talking about fair market values. I think it is unwise for us to allow any agency of government, or any agency in the state to arbitrarily establish what fair market values are. I could see some instances, very easily, where, while this seems like a very generous number, that it may not be. It may be that you have a lot of other things going on in a building or in a rental facility other than a bingo procedure. Three hundred fifty dollars may be a once a week, or once a month type of thing, but that building may be rented, that facility may be rented for 95 other operations, and that could be a very large facility, and it could be a very large lease. I could see how this...and I don't think that is the intention of the Department of Revenue. I understand what their goal is, as Senator Landis pointed out, and I don't have any problem with the goal. I don't think this way of handling it is proper. With what Senator Miller has pointed out is current statute I think gives that department adequate tools to say if there is gouging going on, that will show up that that rental is in excess of fair market value for a piece of property and I think that is a very adequate tool. This is quite arbitrary, however generous it might sound. I think there could be some places where it would not be a very